

## **REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Office for his remarks and observations, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

2. **35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane in view of Uppaluru. In order to describe the invention more clearly, Applicant amends claim 30 to describe:

"operating an interactive user operated Internet voice portal having established multiple predetermined vertical domains of interest and a hierarchy of attributes within each vertical domain of interest from top to bottom, the method comprising operations of:

responsive to a user placing a telephone call to the voice portal, identifying the user and obtaining user selection of a vertical domain of interest;

performing funneling operations comprising:

(a) building a vocabulary set containing top-level attribute values appropriate to the selected vertical domain of interest;

(b) querying the user to choose a top-level attribute value, applying speech recognition to user responses where recognized answers are limited to contents of the vocabulary set;

(c) until a bottom level attribute value is chosen, repeatedly performing operations comprising: (1) building an updated vocabulary set containing attribute values appropriate to the latest chosen attribute value, and (2) querying the user to choose a next-lower-level attribute value and applying speech recognition to user responses where recognized answers are limited to contents of the updated vocabulary set;

responsive to a bottom level attribute being chosen, conducting an Internet search of HTML non-voice sources for prescribed types of information pertaining to the chosen bottom-level attribute value and, unassisted by voice

extensions to said HTML, audibly providing resultant information to the user via the telephone call.”

Applicant notes that the system of Krane attempts to solve the problem of providing Internet access to data that is published in audio or spoken format. Krane describes a system for accessing pre-recorded audio messages over the Internet. Similar to Krane, Uppaluru describes a system and method for accessing voice and speech data files. Uppaluru’s voice and speech data files, as shown and described in Figure 9 and at cols. 20-21 are pre-recorded audio information published specifically for access by users using a voice web browser. Additionally, as described at col. 8, lines 21-23, and lines 31-35 and at col. 12, lines 3-5, Uppaluru provides the capability of rendering non-voice data in the spoken word in extremely limited circumstances. Uppaluru describes a limited sub-set of the Internet, which is designated the “voice web.” Uppaluru’s voice web includes only web sites containing pages that have been extended with a variant of HTML, HVML (Hyper voice markup language). While it is possible to render textual information in the spoken word using Uppaluru’s system, the information to be spoken must be included in an HVML page and it must be identified using “voice tags” and further identified using a “type” attribute. Additionally, using Uppaluru’s system, email can also be played for a user using text-to-speech conversion. However, the email facility can only be accessed from a “personal voice web”—a “standardized collection of linked voice web pages and web forms . . . .”

Applicant also notes the Office’s mistaken assertion that Uppaluru’s voice web pages are completely accessible by a conventional web browser. While Applicant agrees that Uppaluru, at the cited portions, states that HVML pages can be accessed by a conventional web browser, at col. 7, lines 27-30, Uppaluru also states, “The additional markup tags are interpreted by an HVML extended web browser to enable subscribers 107 to navigate and access voice web pages over the phone or similar voice-activated device.” Thus, not only does Uppaluru require that pages be coded with a special variant of HTML—HVML—, wherein content to be rendered in the spoken word is indicated by special HVML tags, it also requires special client software in order to take advantage of the voice feature of the HVML pages.

Thus, both Krane and Uppaluru both provide access to an extremely limited universe of information.

In sharp contrast, the claims are concerned with extending access to the Internet to anyone using convenient and readily available means. Therefore, as shown in Figures 28 and 29 and described at page 35, line 20 to page 38, line 1, non-spoken or non-audio information, such as text, retrieved from the Internet is transformed into spoken output. Additionally, as described at page 10, line 29 to page 11, line 2, the invention accomplishes this by searching the internet for HTML non-voice sources of information. Additionally, the invention does not require that the HTML contain voice extensions or any other type of voice-enabling technology, as do Uppaluru's HVML pages.

Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of claim 28 in the combination.

In fact, Uppaluru explicitly teaches away from the subject matter of amended claim 28. Applicant notes that at col. 7, lines 11-33, Uppaluru takes great pains to distinguish voice web pages from conventional web pages, discussing the shortcomings of conventional HTML web pages and explaining why they are unsuitable for telephone users.

Accordingly, claim 28 is deemed allowable over the combination of Krane and Uppaluru. In view of their dependence from an allowable parent, the dependent claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

No new matter is added by way of the foregoing amendment. The amendment is made solely for the purpose of describing the invention more clearly, in deference to the Office policy of compact prosecution. Such amendment is not an indication of Applicant's agreement with the Office's position, nor does it signify Applicant's intention to sacrifice claim scope. Application expressly reserves the right to pursue patent protection of a scope it reasonably believes it is entitled to in one or more continuing applications.

New claim 33 is added to the application. Support for the added claim is found in the specification, at least at page 47, line 9 to page 49, line 27; page 29, lines 11 to

page 35, line 10; and at page 41, line 15 to page 43, line 2. Support for new claims 34 and 35 is found in previously presented claims 29 and 30. No new matter is therefore added to the application by way of new claims 33-35.

As previously indicated, Krane is limited to accessing audio sources. Uppaluru has the capability of rendering text as speech using voice-to-speech technology. However, Uppaluru is not capable of performing such transformation to any textual data that is to be found on the internet. The textual data that is to be rendered into spoken word must be in HVML page, and it must be denoted by "voice tags." Additionally, special client software is required to interpret the voice tags. Claim 33 includes the elements:

"applying one or more text patterns to a web page to identify said information and extract it;  
applying a plurality of rules to said information to construct grammatical sentences from said information; and  
rendering said grammatical sentences into spoken words and communicating said spoken words to the user via a telephone call."

There is no teaching in the combination of the above elements.

While Uppaluru can convert specially tagged text to speech, it appears that no formatting or other transformation of the textual data is possible. Thus, for Uppaluru to convey data in grammatically-correct sentences, the text would have to be pre-formatted in those sentences. Unlike Krane and/or Uppaluru, the method of claim 33, identifies information in any web page, voice-enabled or not, extracts the information, applies a plurality of rules to the information, and renders it in the spoken word as grammatically-correct sentences. Accordingly, claim 33 is deemed both novel and inventive in view of the presently-cited references.

For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Office have any questions regarding the Application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael A. Glenn", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22,862